

court to a magistrate judge for “proposed findings of fact and recommendations.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). The Federal Magistrate Act provides that a district court “shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” Id. § 636(b)(1); Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). “[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

III. DISCUSSION


As no objection to the M&R has been made, the parties have waived their right to de novo review of any issues covered in the M&R. After review of the M&R and the entire record, the Court determines that the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge to grant Defendant’s motion to dismiss is fully consistent with and supported by current law. Therefore, the Court adopts the M&R.

IV. CONCLUSION

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

1. The Magistrate Judge’s M&R, (Doc. No. 15), is **ADOPTED**;
2. Defendant Huesker Synthetic GmbH’s motion to dismiss, (Doc. No. 4), is **GRANTED**; and
3. Defendant Huesker Synthetic GmbH is **DISMISSED** from this action.

Signed: June 5, 2020

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Robert J. Conrad, Jr.", written over a horizontal line.

Robert J. Conrad, Jr.
United States District Judge

